



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,863	02/09/2001	John William Shultz	PRO-105.0 CON I 6868/8157	9307
24628	7590	03/11/2003		
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER CHAKRABARTI, ARUN K	
			ART UNIT 1634	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Shultz
	09/780,863	Examiner	Art Unit
	Arun Chakrabarti	1634	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 24, 2002</u>			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL .		2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>43-56</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>54</u> is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 53, and 56</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>45, 47, 50-52, and 55</u> is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some* c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>1</u>		6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>Detailed Action</i>	

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Species other than SEQ ID Nos: 82 and 86 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper submitted on December 24, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 56 recites the limitation "said purified and isolated nucleoside diphosphate kinase" in lines 2-3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 1634

(e) the invention was described in-

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

5. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Han et al. (U.S. Patent 5,763,181) (June 9, 1998).

Han et al teaches a composition for determining the presence or absence of a plurality of predetermined nucleic acid target sequences in a nucleic acid sample (Abstract and Column 6, line 64 to Column 7, line 6) comprising an aqueous solution that contains:

(A) a purified and isolated enzyme whose activity is to release one or more nucleotides from the 3' terminus of a hybridized nucleic acid probe (Column 8, lines 30-35, and Example 2, Column 16, line 25 to Column 18, line 50); and

(B) a plurality of nucleic acid probes, each of the probes being complementary to a predetermined nucleic acid target sequences (Column 8, lines 30-35, and Example 2, Column 16, line 25 to Column 18, line 50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1634

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 43, 44, 46, 48, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Han et al. (U.S. Patent 5,763,181) (June 9, 1998) in view of Stratagene Catalog (1988) (Page 39, Column 1).

Han et al. teaches a composition for determining the presence or absence of a predetermined exogenous nucleic acid target sequences in a nucleic acid sample (Abstract and Column 6, line 64 to Column 7, line 6) comprising:

(A) a purified and isolated enzyme whose activity is to release one or more nucleotides from the 3' terminus of a hybridized nucleic acid probe (Column 8, lines 30-35, and Example 2, Column 16, line 25 to Column 18, line 50); and

Art Unit: 1634

(B) a plurality of nucleic acid probes, each of the probes being complementary to a predetermined nucleic acid target sequences (Column 8, lines 30-35, and Example 2, Column 16, line 25 to Column 18, line 50).

Han et al. teaches a species-specific probe associated with a pathogen (Column 8, lines 47-65).

Han et al. teaches the nucleic acid probes comprising a fluorescent label (Examples 1-2, Column 17, lines 8-44, and Figure 11A).

Han et al. teaches the nucleic acid probes comprising a non-natural nucleotide analog (Example 1).

Han et al. do not teach the motivation to combine all the reagents in the form of a kit.

Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation to combine reagents into kit format (page 39).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine in a suitable container, (A) a purified and isolated enzyme whose activity is to release one or more nucleotides from the 3' terminus of a hybridized nucleic acid probe and

(B) a plurality of nucleic acid probes, each of the probes being complementary to a predetermined nucleic acid target sequences of Han et al. into a kit format as discussed by Stratagene catalog since the Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation for combining reagents of use in an assay into a kit, "Each kit provides two services: 1) a variety of different reagents have been assembled and pre-mixed specifically for a defined set of experiments. Thus one need not

Art Unit: 1634

purchase gram quantities of 10 different reagents, each of which is needed in only microgram amounts, when beginning a series of experiments. When one considers all of the unused chemicals that typically accumulate in weighing rooms, desiccators, and freezers, one quickly realizes that it is actually far more expensive for a small number of users to prepare most buffer solutions from the basic reagents. Stratagene provides only the quantities you will actually need, premixed and tested. In actuality, the kit format saves money and resources for everyone by dramatically reducing waste. 2) The other service provided in a kit is quality control (page 39, column 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 45, 47, 50-52, and 55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 54 is allowed.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday.

Art Unit: 1634

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7401. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (703)605-1237.

Arun Chakrabarti,

Patent Examiner,

February 14, 2003



ARUN K. CHAKRABARTI
PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Claims 45 and 47 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising 7 and 34 distinct nucleic acid sequences respectively. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for each of the claims 45 and 47, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

2. A telephone call was made to Shannon Nebolsky on July 23, 2002 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CAR 1.143).

3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CAR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any

Art Unit: 1634

amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CAR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CAR 1.17(l).

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (703) 605-1237. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission via the P.T.O. Fax Center located In Crystal Mall 1. The CM1 Fax Center numbers for Technology Center 1600 are either (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242. Please note that the faxing of such papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published In the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Arun Chakrabarti

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1634,

July 25, 2002